arXiv:0910.3934v1 [gr-qc] 20 Oct 2009

ON THE TUNNELLING THROUGH THE BLACK HOLE HORIZON

V. A. BELINSKI
ICRANET, 65122, Pescara, Italy (e-mail: belinski@icra.it)

Abstract

It is shown that the quasiclassical tunnelling in black hole spacetime proposed in papers [1-5] in fact does not work.

During the last decade a paper train appeared trying to introduce the particle creation by the Schwarzschild black hole as quasiclassical tunnelling through the infinitesimal neighbourhood of the black hole horizon, i.e. through the region between $r_g - 0$ and $r_g + 0$. The first articles containing such idea are [1,2][1] and these gave birth to many successors among which are publications [3,4,5]. The argumentation of all these papers are as following. In Schwarzchild metric

$$-ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{r_g}{r}\right) c^2 dt^2 + \left(1 - \frac{r_g}{r}\right)^{-1} dr^2 \tag{(1)}$$

the particle's action has the form

$$S = -Et + W(r), \tag{(2)}$$

and Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the function $W(r)$ corresponding to the *outgoing* trajectories gives:

$$\frac{dW}{dr} = \frac{\sqrt{E^2 r^2 - m^2 c^4 r (r - r_g)}}{c(r - r_g)}, \quad E \geqslant mc^2, \quad \sqrt{E^2 r^2 - m^2 c^4 r (r - r_g)} > 0. \tag{(3)}$$

The assertion is that any outgoing trajectory, corresponding to some fixed value of arbitrary constant E, consists of two pieces: one is located in the external space where $r > r_g$ and another one inside the horizon where $r < r_g$ but *each of these two pieces starts at some point of horizon* $r = r_g$. Classically a particle can not propagate between inside and outside of horizon along such trajectory because of the barrier which manifests itself as the pole singularity in the momentum $p(r) = \frac{dW}{dr}$ at the horizon points $r = r_g$ as can be seen from (3). However, quantum mechanically the jump is possible and semiclassical path connecting both pieces of outgoing trajectory goes from $r_g - 0$ to $r_g + 0$ through the complex plane of coordinate r along the infinitesimal semicircle around the singular point $r = r_g$. In result the function $W(r)$ acquires an imaginary addend which is interpreted as imaginary part of the action S responsible for the tunnelling from inside to outside of horizon.

---

[1] The paper [2] has pretensions to do something essential with the back reaction of the particles created by the tunnelling in the black hole spacetime. Moreover, from the author's last statement follows that without back reaction, i.e. in the fixed external gravitational field, the tunnelling "would appear to be precluded". In fact this does not follows from their result. If it were so the imaginary part of the action they obtain would disappear when the back reaction vanish. Instead, in such limit their final formula gives the standard result. Then at best this paper can be considered as an attempt to calculate the back reaction corrections to the conventional fixed external field approach. In the first approximation there is no difference between [2] and all other papers of this sort.

It is easy to see that this proposal is erroneous. First of all it is necessary to specify which horizon we are talking about, future or past , because equation $r = r_g$ corresponds to the both cases. If we keep in mind the *future horizon* then it is clear that no outgoing classical trajectory can have an external part starting at a point of this horizon and no outgoing classical trajectory can have an internal part which can come into collision with this horizon from inside. This is simple consequence of geodesic equations. For the function $W(r)$ in vicinity to the points $r = r_g$ we have:

$$W(r) = Ec^{-1} r_g \ln \frac{r - r_g}{r_g}, \quad r - r_g \to 0. \tag{(4)}$$

Since the trajectories follows from the relation $\frac{dS}{dE} = const.$, the equation for the trajectories near horizon is:

$$-t + c^{-1} r_g \ln \frac{r - r_g}{r_g} = const., \quad r - r_g \to 0. \tag{(5)}$$

from which it is obvious that at $r \to r_g$ *the Schwarzschild time t along any external trajectory tends to minus infinity while the future horizon corresponds to plus infinity.* Then the both classical pieces of a outgoing trajectory have no chance to touch the future horizon. Because each of the two parts of the trajectory can not reach any horizon point there are no physical reasons for them to jump to the complex space and they will continue its classical way till when they penetrate the surface of the collapsed object (in case of a black hole formed by the collapse). Then the tunnelling proposed in [1-5] can never happen.

It would be different story if under $r = r_g$ we understand the *past horizon* of an eternal black hole (ignoring the fact that such extension of the Schwarzschild metric has no relation to the physical collapsing objects). In this case the outgoing trajectories indeed cross the set where $r = r_g$, that is the set where in accordance with equation (5) the Schwarzschild time tends to minus infinity. However, even around these points any tunnelling is out of the question. This is because the outgoing trajectories crossing the past horizon corresponds to particles freely propagating in pure classical way from the "white hole" region of eternal black hole to its external space without any obstacles at the points where $r = r_g$. In vicinity of these points, as it is obvious from the Kruskal representation of the extended Schwarzschild spacetime, the behaviour of the outgoing trajectories is the same as of trajectories of free particles in the flat spacetime. Consequently the alteration of action along an outgoing trajectory crossing the past horizon must be real, that is the pole in the integrand of function $W(r)$ can not generate any imaginary part in the action function $S(r)$. That this is indeed the case can be seen immediately by substitution of the asymptotic expression for the variable from (5) into the formula (2) for the action. Taking into account the asymptotic behaviour (4) of $W(r)$ in the vicinity of horizon we see that in the action S the logarithmic terms, originated from the pole in (3), cancel each other and all the rest terms in the action are regular and real as it should be. By another words, the reality of the action in the case under consideration is due to the fact that in the black hole spacetime the variable t (we stress that it is just *variable* since *globally* it is not time) acquire an imaginary addition in the region inside the horizon (which can be seen from the transformation between Schwarzschild and Kruskal coordinates). If one consider a particle travelling between inside and outside of horizon, also this imaginary part coming from the variable t should be taken into account in the action (2). The foregoing simple calculations shows that it cancels exactly that imaginary part which is coming from the function $W(r)$. This fact have been pointed out in [6,7].

The absence of any imaginary part in the action along an infinitesimally small geodesic segment in any regular spacetime neighbourhood is the general consequence of the equivalence principle. Any horizon point in fact is the regular point of space-time in the vicinity of which the locally inertial coordinates can be introduced. In this locally inertial system the equations of geodesics and Hamilton-Jacobi equation for the action are the same as in flat Minkowski spacetime because they depend only on metric and gamma-symbols and do not contain the second or higher order derivatives of the metric tensor. Consequently in such vicinity the alteration of particle's action can acquire no imaginary part (if it were not so the particles would be created in flat Minkowski space). Since the action $S=-mc\int ds$ *along a particle trajectory is an relativistically invariant quantity it can have no imaginary part also in any other coordinates (no matter singular or not) covering this vicinity.*

Some pedagogical attention deserve the Painleve coordinate frame since the widespread delusion is to be found in the literature (first of all in papers [1,2]) that for the problem under consideration the Painleve time is fundamentally better then the Schwarzschild one. In fact any coordinates can be used (if correctly, of course) and there is no sense to think that in the problem we are interested in one can obtain something essentially new just using the Painleve time instead of Schwarzschild one. The Painleve radial coordinate is the same Schwarzschild r and Painleve time t_p can be introduced by the relation:

$$ct_p = ct + 2\sqrt{r_g r} + r_g \ln \frac{\sqrt{r}-\sqrt{r_g}}{\sqrt{r}+\sqrt{r_g}}. \qquad ((6))$$

The Painleve form of the Schwarzschild solution is:

$$-ds^2 = -\left(1 - \frac{r_g}{r}\right) c^2 dt_p^2 + \frac{2\sqrt{r_g}}{\sqrt{r}} c dt_p dr + dr^2. \qquad ((7))$$

The action in Painleve variables can still be written as $S = -E_p t_p + W_p(r)$, where $E_p = const.$ and particle's momentum $p_p(r) = dW_p/dr$. Again we are interested only in the *outgoing* trajectories for which constant E_p is positive, $E_p \geqslant mc^2$ and in the region $r > r_g$ "momentum" $p_p(r) > 0$. For such trajectories the Hamilton-Jacobi equation written in Painleve metric (7) gives:

$$\frac{dW_p}{dr} = \frac{E_p \sqrt{r r_g}}{c\,(r - r_g)} \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\left(E_p^2 - m^2 c^4\right)(r - r_g)}{E_p^2 r_g}}\right), \qquad ((8))$$

where the square root is taken to be positive. Near horizon $r = r_g$ we have asymptotic expression:

$$W_p(r) = 2E_p c^{-1} r_g \ln \frac{r - r_g}{r_g}, \quad r - r_g \to 0. \qquad ((9))$$

The equation of the trajectories follows from the relation $-t_p + dW_p/dE_p = const.$, which in the vicinity to the horizon gives

$$ct_p = 2r_g \ln \frac{r - r_g}{r_g} + k, \quad k = const., \quad r - r_g \to 0. \qquad ((10))$$

This equation demonstrates the same result: if particle trajectory approaches horizon from outside ($r \to r_g$ and $r > r_g$) the Painleve time goes to minus infinity and this corresponds to the *past horizon* because along the outgoing trajectory (10) the connection between Painleve and Schwarzschild times following from (6) is $t_p = 2t + const.$. Consequently minus infinity in Painleve time corresponds to minus infinity in Schwarzschild time. Also the action along the trajectory (10) is regular and real, as can be seen substituting expressions (10) for t_p and (9) for $W_p(r)$ into formula $S = -E_p t_p + W_p(r)$. This is due to the fact that *Painleve time t_p is regular and real only around the future horizon but in the vicinity of the past horizon this variable is as "bad" as Schwarzschild time, no difference.* On the past horizon t_p goes to minus infinity and acquire an imaginary addend after crossing it which cancels the corresponding imaginary part of function $W_p(r)$.

The same can be seen in more thorough way using the Kruskal picture. The transformation between Schwarzschild coordinates (t, r) and Kruskal coordinates (η, ζ), where η is timelike and ζ-spacelike, is:

$$r + r_g \ln\left(\frac{r}{r_g} - 1\right) + ct = 2r_g \ln(\zeta + \eta)\,, \ r + r_g \ln\left(\frac{r}{r_g} - 1\right) - ct = 2r_g \ln(\zeta - \eta)\,. \qquad ((11))$$

The metric (1) takes the form:

$$-ds^2 = \frac{4r_g^3}{r} e^{-r/r_g}\left(-d\eta^2 + d\zeta^2\right), \quad \eta^2 - \zeta^2 = \left(1 - \frac{r}{r_g}\right) e^{r/r_g}. \qquad ((12))$$

From (11) and (6) follows the transformation between Painleve coordinates (t_p, r) and Kruskal coordinates $(\eta,\, \zeta)$:

$$2r_g \ln(\zeta+\eta) = ct_p - 2\sqrt{r_g r} + r - r_g \ln \frac{r_g}{\left(\sqrt{r}+\sqrt{r_g}\right)^2}, \qquad ((13))$$

$$2r_g \ln(\zeta-\eta) = -ct_p + 2\sqrt{r_g r} + r + r_g \ln \frac{r_g}{\left(\sqrt{r}+\sqrt{r_g}\right)^2} + 2r_g \ln \frac{r-r_g}{r_g}. \qquad ((14))$$

From the last formulas we have also the following useful relation:

$$ct_p = 2r_g \ln(\zeta+\eta) + 2\sqrt{r_g r} - r + r_g \ln \frac{r_g}{\left(\sqrt{r}+\sqrt{r_g}\right)^2}, \qquad ((15))$$

from which it is evident that if $r \to r_g$ and $t_p \ \to -\infty$ then $\zeta+\eta \to 0$ from the side $\zeta+\eta > 0$. The Kruskal variable $\zeta-\eta$ in this limit remains some positive arbitrary constant. This means that the line (10) which looks "disrupted" in Painleve coordinates in fact is the smooth regular line emerging from the "white hole" region $\zeta+\eta<0$, intersecting the past horizon $\zeta+\eta=0$ at some its arbitrary point and continuing its way into the external region $\zeta+\eta>0$ towards the spatial infinity.

The equation of the "disrupted" trajectory (10) in the vicinity to the past horizon in Kruskal variables follows uniquely from (13)-(14) and it is just a regular straight line segment:

$$\zeta = V\eta + \zeta_0, \qquad ((16))$$

where the constants V and ζ_0 are the following function on the original Painleve arbitrary parameters E_p and k:

$$V = \frac{1 - b\exp(a_2-a_1)}{1 + b\exp(a_2-a_1)}, \quad \zeta_0 = \frac{\exp(a_2)}{1 + b\exp(a_2-a_1)}, \qquad ((17))$$

$$a_1 = \frac{k - r_g(1-\ln 4)}{2r_g}\ , \quad a_2 = \frac{-k + r_g(3-\ln 4)}{2r_g}, \quad b = \frac{m^2c^4}{4E_p^2}. \qquad ((18))$$

(m is the mass of a particle). This line intersects past horizon at the point $(\zeta,\eta) = \left(\frac{1}{2}e^{a_2}, -\frac{1}{2}e^{a_2}\right)$. All this clearly shows that the pole singularity in equation (8) which seems to tear the particle trajectory into two pieces in fact represents the pure coordinate phenomenon (i.e. singular behaviour of the Painleve time on the past horizon) which can not have any physical consequences. It is evident that calculation of the action $S = -mc\int ds$ along the regular segment (16) can not results in any imaginary addend.

As for the future horizon we can gain nothing from regularity and reality of Painleve time in that region because no outgoing trajectories exist which would be able to come into collision with future horizon. The main advantage of Painleve time in this region is irrelevant for the problem under consideration.

Finally we add the following remark in order to avoid misunderstanding, the source of which is confusion of notions between the case of stationary potential's non-relativistic quantum mechanics and properties of the black hole spacetime. *The Schwarzschild and Painleve "time" variables are spacelike under the horizon and conserved quantities E and E_p globally are not energies.* Therefore it would be mistake to apply for a black hole the tunnelling approach coming from the standard Schrodinger theory for the stationary potential, since there is no sense to use under the horizon the Schrodinger equation with spacelike variable t, or t_p, in place of time. Does not exist coordinates by which one can cover both sides of the horizon of a black hole in such a way that one of these coordinates is timelike globally and metric does not depends on it. *The black hole spacetime is not only non-static, it is also non-stationary independently of which system of reference we use, including the Painleve coordinates.* Then to be able to speak about quantum mechanics and tunnelling one need to introduce first the coordinate which would be regular and timelike both outside and inside of the horizon. However, the metric in this case will be unavoidable time-dependent. Therefore we come to the necessity to apply the quasiclassical tunnelling approach to the essentially time-dependent external gravitational field which is quite different from that naive extrapolation of the non-relativistic theory for the stationary potentials proposed in [1-5]. The calculation of the action $S = -mc\int ds$ along quasiclassical complex trajectory in black hole spacetime must take into account in that or another way the contribution from all variables involved. The best way to do this is to use the Kruskal coordinates from the outset. This was done in [8] and the result is that in the spacetime of a black hole formed by the collapse no quasiclassical tunnelling trajectories between inside and outside of horizon can be found.

REFERENCES

[1] G.Volovik "Simulation of Painleve-Gullstrand black hole in thin He^3-A film", JETP Lett. **69**, 705 (1999) [arXiv:gr-qc/9901077].

[2] M.K.Parikh and F.Wilczek "Hawking Radiation as Tunnelling", Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5042 (2000) [arXiv:hep-th/9907001].

[3] M.Angheben, M.Nadalini, L.Vanzo and S.Zerbini "Hawking Radiation as Tunnelling for Extremal and Rotating Black Holes", JHEP **0505, 014** (2005) [arXiv:hepth/0503081].

[4] M.Nadalini, L.Vanzo and S.Zerbini "Hawking Radiation as Tunnelling: the D dimensional rotating case", J.Phys. A**39,** 6601 (2006) [arXiv:hep-th/0511250].

[5] R. Di Criscienzo, S.A.Hayward, M.Nadalini, L.Vanzo and S.Zerbini "Invariance of the Tunnelling Method for Dinamical Black Holes", [arXiv:gr-qc/0906.1725].

[6] V.Belinski "Quantum Fields in Black Hole Spacetime and in Accelerated Sistems", AIP proceedings, **910**, 270, Ed. M.Novello and S. Bergliaffa (2007).

(Lectures delivered at the XII Brazilian School of Cosmology and Gravitation, Rio de Janeiro, 10-23 September, 2006).

[7] M.Pizzi "The time factor in the semi-classical approach to the Hawking radiation", [arXiv:gr-qc/0904.4572].

[8] V. Belinski "On the existence of black hole evaporation yet again", Phys. Lett. **A354**, 249 (2006) [arXiv:gr-qc/0607137].